United Nations DP/2002/16

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund

Distr.: General
9 May 2002

Original: English

Annual session
17-28 June 2002, Geneva
Item 11 of the provisional agenda
UNDP funding commitments

Status of regular funding commitments to UNDP and its associated funds and programmes for 2002 and onward*

I. INTRODUCTION

1. UNDP and its associated funds and programmes continue to make significant progress in implementing the reform programme outlined in the Business Plans. In its decision 2002/4, the Executive Board took note of the report on the UNDP Business Plans, 2000-2003 (DP/2002/CPR.2), which, together with the multi-year funding framework (MYFF) and the results-oriented annual report (ROAR), form the linchpin of the efforts for the overall reform of the organization. Significant progress was achieved in 2001 in institutionalizing the reform through all layers of the organization, with special focus on improving performance to strengthen partnerships with a range of intergovernmental, governmental and civil society organizations and to realign applied policy and substantive capacity.

2. At the same time, mobilizing an adequate level of regular ("core") resources to maximize the unique impact that a strong, multilateral United Nations development presence can have remains a top priority. In 2001, UNDP was able to turn around the long downward trend in contributions to regular resources, which increased for the first time in eight years, reflecting increased political will and support to the organization. While very encouraging, the growth trend remains fragile. The increase in 2001 is modest in relation to the agreed targets for regular resources set by the Executive Board and to what is actually required to maximize the impact of UNDP work, particularly in least developed countries.

3. The issue of restoring growth and enhanced predictability to the regular funding of the United Nations development activities has been discussed widely, including in the context of the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities (E/2001/66). Progress has been made to ensure that the profile of UNDP, and the importance of adequate funding of the United Nations in development more broadly, is more consistently reviewed at ministerial levels in national, regional and international settings. The reform effort is starting to reap significant dividends in terms of political support and recognition of the unique role that UNDP and its associated funds and programmes can play. The challenge remains to consolidate of the recent upward trend in contributions to resources and sustained and substantial increases in the regular resource base of the organization.

* The collection and analysis of current data required to present the Executive Board with the most up-to-date information has delayed submission of the present document.

02-38320 (E) 170502

II. BACKGROUND

4. Through its decisions 98/23, 99/1 and 99/23, the Executive Board has put in place a funding system for UNDP designed to generate a transparent dialogue on regular funding and to facilitate greater volume and enhanced predictability. Through these decisions, the Board adopted an annual funding target of $1.1 billion and stressed the urgent need to achieve annual increases until the target is met. The Board reaffirmed the need to reverse the downward trend in core resources and to establish a mechanism to place UNDP core funding on a predictable basis. In this context, UNDP was requested to develop the multi-year funding framework, which integrates programme objectives, resources, budget and outcomes with the aim of increasing regular resources. In its legislation, the Board also recognized that overdependence on a limited number of donors carries risks for the long-term financial sustainability of UNDP and therefore urged all countries in a position to do so to increase their core contributions. The second ROAR (DP/2001/14 Add.1) was submitted to the Executive Board at its annual session 2001; the Board will consider the third ROAR (DP/2002/15) at its current session. In its decision 2001/17, the Board took note of the update on the MYFF and revised integrated resources framework (DP/2001/25).

5. The MYFF provides the key tool by which to respond to programme country needs in a flexible, coherent manner, based on the concept of collective ownership and partnership, regardless of funding source. The MYFF acknowledges the importance of a sustained increase in the level of regular resources as a key constituent of the character and operations of multilateral organizations.

6. In 2001, implementation of the Business Plans focused on driving the reforms through all layers of the organization, with particular emphasis on the country level where UNDP's performance matters the most. In the area of policy, substantive capacity was fully realigned with key priority areas and, in large part, decentralized to subregional resource facilities (SURFs) in the regions to enhance responsiveness and ability to support the country offices. In the area of partnerships, significant progress was made in strengthening a wide range of partnerships, most notably within the United Nations family, through the United Nations Development Group and the United Nations Country Teams, the Bretton Woods institutions and regional development banks, the European Commission and non-governmental actors within civil society and the corporate sector. In the area of people and performance, a coherent set of management tools and benchmarks was introduced to strengthen assessment, monitoring and improvement of performance at corporate, unit and individual levels.

7. In accordance with Executive Board decision 99/2, the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) presented its first ROAR in 2001 (DP/2001/17), which was welcomed by the Executive Board (decision 2001/17). Its second ROAR will be presented to the Board at its current session (DP/2002/14). The report builds on the experience gained during the previous year and reflects UNCDF commitment to results-based management. In 2001, UNCDF made some modest progress in the mobilization of regular resources. Nevertheless, it is of considerable concern that current resource levels fall far short of the demand from programme countries for investment and capacity-building services by UNCDF in the areas of microfinance and local governance. This funding situation contrasts with the Fund's performance on the ground, recognized by the Executive Board in its decision 99/22. It is imperative that UNCDF be given the financial capacity to meet the demands for its services as a pilot, risk-taking small-scale investment organization, whose complementarity to other development partners has been fully documented.

8. The United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) continues to be guided by its strategy and business plan 2000 – 2003 approved by the Executive Board in its decision 2000/7. The plan focuses on increasing options and opportunities for women, particularly those living in poverty, and strengthening the United Nations system capacity to support women's empowerment and gender-mainstreaming. UNIFEM celebrated its 25th anniversary in 2001, the fourth consecutive year in which it recorded increases in core resources. Increased cost-sharing resources enabled the organization to expand its work on gender analysis of national and local budgets, as well as on women and peace and security in all regions, including a strong role for UNIFEM in supporting women's leadership in the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Increased synergy with United Nations agencies, included the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Joint (UN) Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) to support action on the gender and human rights dimensions of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Expanded cooperation with UNDP led to agreements for UNIFEM to execute 11 projects (following Executive Board decision 2000/7). In 2001, a total of 51 UNDP country offices reported on partnerships and consultations with UNIFEM, up 12 per cent from the previous year.

9. The year 2001, the thirtieth anniversary of the United Nations Volunteers Programme (UNV), marked an important turning point for the organization. As focal point for the International Year of Volunteers 2001, UNV used the Year strategically as an opportunity, not only to re-articulate its core mandate but also to test and confirm the relevance thereof in its activities in the field. In so doing, UNV deepened its own understanding of the value of volunteerism and the important economic and social contributions that it makes to society. The year 2001 also marked the fifth successive year of growth of the Programme with some 5,100 volunteers – representing 160 nationalities – carrying out over 5,400 assignments in 140 countries. In financial terms, the magnitude of the Programme again surpassed $100 million. Of this, only some 6 per cent was financed from the Special Voluntary Fund (SVF). Looking ahead, the opportunities the Year has presented to UNV in further strengthening its role as the volunteer arm of the United Nations, together with the anticipated contributions to the SVF for 2002 suggest that the positive trends will continue. The Administrator will report separately on UNV to the Executive Board at the current session (DP/2002/18).

III. PREPARATORY PROCESS

10. In early February 2002, the secretariat wrote to all States members of UNDP to outline the preparatory process for this year's annual funding meeting on UNDP and its associated funds and programmes, UNCDF, UNIFEM and UNV. In line with Executive Board decisions 98/23 and 99/1, reaffirmed in decisions 99/23 and 2000/1, members of the Programme were requested to communicate in writing their voluntary contributions for UNDP and its associated funds and programmes and were encouraged to provide multi-year pledges and fixed payment schedules. As with previous annual funding meetings, members of the Programme were encouraged to address three of the five main elements of Executive Board decision 98/23: volume of regular resources; predictability; and measures to reduce financial dependence on a limited number of donors.

11. Specifically, members of the Programme were requested to communicate in writing to the secretariat, no later than 31 March 2002, but preferably as early as possible in the year: (a) a firm funding commitment for the current year (2002); for those in a position to do so, a firm contribution or indication of the contribution for the following year (2003); and a firm or tentative contribution for the third year (2004) if possible; and (b) a schedule of payments based on one of the following: (i) early payment in full; (ii) quarterly payments at the beginning of each quarter; or (iii) twice-yearly payments at the beginning of each half-year.

12. Tables 1 and 2 (see annex II) have been prepared on the basis of receipt of the above information. As of the time of preparing the present report, while several members of the Programme had communicated their firm 2002 pledges and, in some cases, their indicative pledges for 2003 and 2004, including their payment schedules, a number of members were not yet in a position to do so. Consequently, best estimates of 2002 contributions have been provided by the secretariat in some cases. Table 3 (see annex II) provides information on government in-kind contributions.

13. It is important to bear in mind that all 2001 figures represent provisional data and are subject to modification upon confirmation of actual income figures for the year. An updated version of the summary tabular presentation will be circulated as a conference room paper (DP/2002/CRP.8) in advance of the annual session of the Executive Board in order to provide as up-to-date a picture as possible on progress towards achieving the key objectives of the legislation with respect to resources, outlined in decisions 98/23 and 99/1.

IV. VOLUME

14. In 2001, for the first time in eight years, UNDP was able to reverse the long downward trend of its regular resource base. Provisional data show that net income for the year 2001 reached $652 million. This represents an increase of three per cent, or $18 million, over the level of contributions achieved in 2000. Current projections for the gross contributions to regular resources for 2002, using the United Nations official exchange rate of 1 April 2002, are $658 million.

15. It is particularly encouraging to note that 13 members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) increased their contributions in local currency terms, many for the second consecutive year, with three countries increasing by over 34per cent. Three OECD/DAC countries reduced their contributions, in one case by a substantial amount. In demonstration of their strong commitment to rebuilding the political will for UNDP and its resource base, three OECD/DAC donors (Finland, Italy and the United Kingdom) announced additional contributions to regular resources for 2001 over and above their original pledge for the year. All but two donors paid their contributions in full in 2001.

16. That same political commitment to an enhanced regular resource base for UNDP was also reflected by the fact that some 44 programme countries made contributions to the regular resource base of the organization in 2001, often despite considerable internal constraints. Developments in the volume of contributions to regular resources are encouraging, reflecting a sustained commitment to the rebuilding of the regular resource base of the organization, including 10 programme countries that increased their net core contributions from the previous year and 13 programme countries that commenced or resumed payments.

17. The exchange rate was a significant factor in concealing the broad-based character of the turn-around, with regard particularly to the continued strength of the United States dollar, which throughout 2001 appreciated against most currencies, including the euro and other major European currencies that together constitute over two thirds of the UNDP current regular resource base.

18. Regarding 2002, according to current projections, at least 12 OECD/DAC donors are expected to increase their contributions, as compared with their original 2001 pledges, with four donors increasing by over 10 per cent, one by over 44 per cent, and one donor resuming its contribution. One donor is expected to reduce its contribution. While letters of commitment were received from a number of countries prior to finalization of the present document, estimates have been made for several contributing countries. As noted below, this is particularly the case for many programme countries since their net core contributions are not known until after the application of the accounting linkage. With the introduction of the euro, States members have communicated their pledges in this currency, except for one, which communicated its pledge in both euro and legacy currency.

19. In 2002, at least 13 programme countries are expected to increase their contributions to regular resources, with seven resuming contribution. The fact that four programme countries are projected to make contributions to regular resources of UNDP above $1 million is very encouraging, both as an indication of the high value programme countries place on UNDP work and for its positive impact on reducing overdependence.

20. The fact that many OECD/DAC donors and programme countries have either resumed and/or sustained their growth in contributions for the second and third consecutive year is very encouraging. As with the previous two years, there have also been indications that some donors may be in a position to make additional pledges and payments to regular resources during the year. This will be particularly important given that, despite this strong show of political support, anticipated income levels for 2002 continue to be below that which would put UNDP on a solid financial foundation.

21. Recent trends have shown a significant increase in other ("non-core") resource contributions to UNDP. In 2001, provisional data show that donor co-financing to UNDP amounted to some $672 million, bringing donor resources (contributions to regular resources and donor co-financing) to over $1.3 billion; virtually all OECD/DAC donors are now active in co-financing UNDP programmes. Local resources, consisting of government (programme-country) cost-sharing, channelled through UNDP by governments in support of their own development programmes, amounted to just over $1.1 billion.

22. In 2001, UNDP established thematic trust funds in key thematic areas, as a flexible co-financing instrument designed to mobilize additional funding to meet programme country demands, particularly least developed countries, as outlined in the MYFF. This facility is aimed to attract funds not readily available either for regular resources or for other multi-bilateral funding at the country level, to be channelled into a consistent set of development interventions across countries and regions. Other resources represent an important complement to the regular resource base, permitting an extension of the impact of the programmes and fostering a broad range of partnerships, including the international and regional development banks, the European Commission and others. It should be noted that the aggregate income figure for 2001 of $2.58 billion (including funds from other sources), which represents an increase of 9.3 per cent over the level

achieved in the previous year, masks the still fragile situation that UNDP is facing in its regular resource base. Regular and other resources are not interchangeable; other resources represent earmarked contributions to specific themes, programmes and activities, and tend to be geographically concentrated. The ability of UNDP to mobilize such resources depends on its having an adequate, secure multilateral base from which to provide its proven development expertise.

23. Further to a steady decline in UNCDF regular resource contributions since 1996, in 2001, the negative trend was reversed, and UNCDF recorded an increase of one per cent in regular resource income, to $24.3 million. Five OECD/DAC donors increased their contributions in local currency terms and the Fund enlarged its support base with two new OECD/DAC donors to regular resources. In accordance with its 2001-2002 Business Plan, UNCDF seeks an increase in regular resource contributions to $30 million by 2003 as well as an increase in non-core funding from $5.5 million to $10 million. UNCDF will also continue to work towards widening its geographic resource base in the spirit of greater burden-sharing among contributors.

24. UNIFEM regular resource contributions reached $21.0 million in 2001, compared with $19.1 million in 2000. This represents an increase of $1.9 million or 10 per cent. Seven donor governments increased their regular resource contributions and one government contributed for the first time. In 2001, UNIFEM experienced a significant increase in other resources, to a total of $11 million. UNIFEM total income rose to $32.0 million, an increase of $2.6 million or 8 per cent over the previous year. UNIFEM is strengthening its resource mobilization efforts to reach its goal of $40 million from all sources by the end of 2003.

25. For UNV, the Special Voluntary Fund (SVF), although small, is crucial in enabling the Programme to initiate, as a partner in development, creative and pioneering activities in the field that demonstrate the role that volunteerism and volunteers can play in social and economic development. Thanks to the resumption of an increase in contributions by some OECD/DAC donors, voluntary contributions to the SVF increased to nearly $4 million in 2001, an increase of 25 per cent over that of 2000. UNV aims to reach an optimal total of $10 million annually. In this regard, it is particularly encouraging that both increases from current donors as well as contributions from new donors are anticipated for 2002.

V. PREDICTABILITY

26. In order to enhance predictability, as outlined in Executive Board decision 98/23, and reaffirmed in decision 99/1, members are encouraged to provide multi-year pledges (see paragraph 11).

27. At the time of writing, 11 countries had made indicative pledges for 2003, including seven OECD/DAC donors and four programme countries; four countries made pledges for 2004. In 2001, a total of 10 OECD/DAC donor countries and eight programme countries had made multi-year pledges. In all cases, the amount pledged for 2003 and 2004 is at least at the same level as that of 2002 (subject to government or parliamentary approval). Significantly, at least five countries have set a clear precedent of using the multi-year commitments previously communicated as a floor from which to make increases in subsequent years. A number of States members of UNDP that are unable to provide a multi-year pledge formally, because of national legislative and other restrictions, have nevertheless provided the Programme with indicative amounts for forthcoming years, in recognition of the value of this in terms of financial predictability. In view of the importance to enhance further the predictability of the UNDP resource base, members of the Programme are very much encouraged, where possible, to provide multi-year pledges.

28. In addition to providing multi-year pledges, the Executive Board determined in its decision 98/23 that the predictability of core resources could be further enhanced if States members of the Programme announced specific payment schedules, with early payment encouraged. In paragraph 12 (b) (iii) of its decision 98/23, the Board decided, inter alia, to review at the funding meeting the timing of payments made in the previous calendar year.

29. There have been considerable improvements in payment performance, which in 2001 was significantly better than the previous year. In 2001, a total of 17 OECD/DAC donor countries provided fixed payment schedules, covering 80 per cent of the total OECD/DAC pledges. While not all payment schedules were adhered to completely, nevertheless, the schedules facilitated financial management to some extent. Early payment was a particularly important and very positive factor By July, over 70 per cent of pledged contributions had been received, compared with 55 per cent in 2000, helped significantly by the earlier payment of contributions by a major donor. As a result, the cash-flow and the liquidity position

of the organization improved significantly, thus avoiding the use of operational reserves for most of 2001. Nonetheless, a number of donors continued to pay significant proportions of their pledges in the last quarter of the year, with some 6 per cent of total commitments falling due in December. The timeliness of payment of contributions is essential to avoid liquidity constraints and is a key factor for the achievement of the goal of greater predictability of income.

30. In line with paragraph 11, table 2 (annex II) provides payment schedules for 2002 contributions communicated to the Secretariat by 31 March 2002. The secretariat notes the efforts on the part of 11 OECD/DAC donors to announce payment schedules, and welcomes all efforts made to bring forward the timing of payments. Members that have not already done so are strongly encouraged to inform the secretariat of their intended payment schedules, including where possible, early payment. All members are encouraged to adhere to the same schedule in terms of currency and timing of payments. UNCDF will also seek to enhance the predictability of its resource base through multi-year funding pledges, consistent with decision 99/22 requesting additional resources and a more secure funding base for the Fund.

31. On a very positive note, two OECD/DAC donors and 20 programme countries have assumed any exchange risk directly by making their pledge for 2002 in dollars.

VI. REDUCING OVERDEPENDENCE ON A LIMITED NUMBER OF DONORS

32. In its decisions 98/23 and 99/1, the Executive Board recognized that overdependence on a limited number of donors carries risks for the long-term financial sustainability of UNDP and urged all donors and programme countries in a position to do so to increase their contributions to regular resources. In its decision 99/22, the Board similarly recognized the same issues for UNCDF and invited all countries in a position to do so to make voluntary contributions to the Fund in order to secure adequate funding.

33. With the aim of reducing overdependence and broadening the donor base, the Administrator has spearheaded concerted efforts on the part of UNDP to reach out systematically to parliamentarians and other key decision-makers in both donor and programme country capitals, as well as regional and international forums, in order to build commitment for common action to ensure that the resource base of the organization is rebuilt to agreed target levels.

34. As indicated in paragraph 18, many OECD/DAC donors have responded to the call. It is currently estimated, however, that the top 10 donors to UNDP will provide 85 per cent of the total 2002 regular resources of UNDP. It is clear that there are a number of risks when there is a continued overdependence by a multilateral organization such as UNDP on a limited number of donors.

35. As requested during the first annual funding meeting and implemented in 2000, table 1 (annex II) also provides the 2002 contributions to regular resources of the OECD/DAC donors in per capita terms (see annex 1, notes on methodology). Taking this as the basis, the top contributors to UNDP for 2002 (at least $1 per capita), in per capita terms are (in order): Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Netherlands, Finland, Ireland and Luxembourg.

36. As noted in paragraph 19, many programme countries continue to contribute to reducing overdependence in several important ways. Programme country governments provide UNDP with: (a) contributions to UNDP regular resources; (b) government cash contributions towards local office costs; and (c) government in-kind contributions, e.g., the provision of rent-free office premises, in addition to providing substantial amounts of cost-sharing resources to UNDP programmes in their respective countries.

37. The total amount of regular resource contributions from programme countries after the application of the accounting linkage to government local office cost has remained stable in dollar terms during the last four years, reaching $18.4 million for 2001. In view of the strong United States dollar in relation to many of these currencies, this represents a significant increase in local currency terms.

38. UNIFEM is employing a number of strategies to build a more diversified funding base, both to regular and other resources, the latter including international NGOs and private foundations. UNIFEM is also leveraging funds through other multilateral agencies and is currently working with its 19 national committees to strengthen their fund-raising capacity for the agency's programmes and priorities. A revised set of standards is being instituted to increase the ability of committees to raise visibility and support for UNIFEM with non-traditional donors in their countries. Similarly, the efforts undertaken by UNV to build a more diversified resource base yielded some positive results with two new OECD/DAC donors in 2001 and a

commitment by two additional OECD/DAC donors in 2002. As the achievements of the UNV programme and the UNV volunteers gain increasing recognition, UNV anticipates that it will further succeed in enlarging its resource base.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

39. In 2001, UNDP was able to turn around the long downward trend in regular resource levels. Regular resources increased for the first time in eight years, reflecting the increased political will and support to the organization and its reform efforts. Particularly notable is the sustained effort on the part of many OECD/DAC donors, and a number of programme countries, to provide annual increases in local currency terms almost consistently since the introduction of the MYFF and the core funding strategy. The MYFF continues to provide the key instrument for reporting on results and mobilizing resources in response to country demand. Demonstrating clear results through the ROAR provides an important additional stimulus to mobilize regular resources in capitals.

40. While very encouraging for the growing political support for the organization that this reflects, the growth in UNDP regular resources is nevertheless extremely fragile. It remains a key collective challenge to sustain the current upward trend and to rebuild the regular resources to levels necessary for UNDP to be able to play the role required of it by its programme country partners and the international community. In this regard, it is important that there be both joint action to sustain the increase in regular resource levels and additional efforts by all partners to build on the success to date in ensuring that political attention and consideration is given to the rebuilding of funding for UNDP as the key global platform for the development activities of the United Nations.

41. While recent trends have shown a significant increase in other (non-core) resource contributions to UNDP, regular and other resources are not interchangeable. The ability of UNDP to fulfil its mandate and to mobilize other resources depends on its having an adequate, secure regular funding base that guarantees its multilateral, impartial and universal character. The Administrator remains firm in his belief that regular contributions remain the bedrock of UNDP and that putting the regular resource base back on a path of sustainable growth to meet agreed targets remains the top priority.

42. Against this background, the Executive Board may wish to request all countries that have not yet done so, to provide contributions to regular resources for 2002, as well as indicative pledges for future years and payment schedules; and for those that have already announced their contributions, to consider, if they are in a position to do so, supplementing their 2002 contributions, so as to accelerate the rebuilding of the regular resource base of UNDP.

Annex I

Notes on methodology

Table 1 (annex II) forms the basis for the summary presentation on total commitments and/or estimates for 2002 contributions to regular resources, preceded by actual income received from contributions to regular resources in 2000 and 2001, and indicative contributions to regular resources for 2003 and 2004 as a multi-year pledge if so communicated. Anticipated income for 2002 in United States dollars consists of: (a) actual payment according to the official United Nations exchange rate at the time the payment was made; and (b) the remaining balance based on the official United Nations exchange rate as of 1 April 2002. It should be noted that data presented for 2001 and prior years, represent actual income received in the respective year, rather than amounts pledged for that year.

For the OECD/DAC donors, table 1 (annex II) shows the 2002 contributions to regular resources committed by (or estimated for) each individual country for the current year in (a) local currency terms and (b) United States dollar equivalent according to the United Nations official exchange rate of 1 April, 2002. In addition, as requested during the 1999 funding meeting and implemented in 2000, a column reflects per capita contributions in 2002. This is calculated using pledges/estimates for 2002 (excluding 2001 outstanding balances carried forward, where applicable), and 2000 World Bank population data.

For programme countries, table 1 (annex II reflects total pledges received for contributions to regular resources and for government contributions to local office costs (GLOC). All financial information is split into GLOC payments and net contributions to regular resources after the application of the accounting linkage. Final GLOC obligations are based on actual expenditures and not on ex ante budget estimates. Initial GLOC targets are made available to programme countries via country offices in May/June of each calendar year. In arriving at these targets, the in-kind contributions are taken into account. These initial targets are subject to retroactive adjustment and final GLOC targets are established in accordance with actual expenditures. As reconfirmed by the Executive Board in its decision 99/23, the collection of GLOC obligations, after in-kind contributions, is achieved through two distinct mechanisms: (a) direct cash contributions and (b) the application of the accounting linkage to voluntary contributions, whereby voluntary contributions from programme countries are first accounted for against the local office costs obligations based on the final GLOC target. Local office costs obligations of net contributor countries are in principle covered through the Other resources budget line of the individual countries.

Table 2 (annex II) also outlines the specific payment schedules for 2002 contributions to regular resources for those contributing countries that pro ided such a schedule to the secretariat on or before 31 March 2002. Fixed payment schedules permit the organization to establish a known United States dollar value to its contributions for stability and programme planning purposes through the use of financial instruments that ensure in advance a fixed United States dollar amount for the conversion of non-United States dollar contributions. The contractual nature of these financial instruments requires that settlements be effected at the contract dates, hence the critical importance of reliable amounts and strict adherence to payment schedules. All members are encouraged to adhere to their schedule as communicated, in terms of currency and timing of payments.

Finally, table 3 (annex II) shows in-kind contributions provided by programme countries for 2000 and 2001.

Table 1(a). Commitments/estimates to UNDP regular resources, 2002-2004
and income to UNDP regular resources and government local office costs, 2000-2001
(in local currency and US dollars, based on United Nations exchange rates as of 1 April 2002)

1.a. OECD/DAC members	2000 income received			2001 income received (preliminary) a/				2002 pledges/estimates				Voluntary contributions per capita ($)c/	2003 pledges		2004 pledges	
	Local currency (in millions)	$	share of total core contribution	Local currency (in millions)	$	change in local currency	change in $	Local currency (in millions)	$	change in, b/ local currency	change in, b/ $		Local currency (in millions)	$	Local currency (in millions)	$
Australia	7.0	4,000,000	0.6%	7.0	3,626,943	0.0%	-9.3%	7.00 *	3,684,211	0.0%	1.6%	0.19				
Austria	76.8	5,431,222	0.9%	43.2	2,829,396	-32.1%	-47.9%	4.14 d/	3,627,418	15.7%	12.7%	0.39				
Belgium	464.2	11,565,043	1.8%	988.0	22,258,265	-11.4%	4.4%	11.50	10,062,992	0.0%	-1.1%	0.98	11.5	10,062,992		
Canada	42.3	28,581,081	4.5%	42.3	26,942,875	0.0%	-5.7%	43.00	27,044,025	1.7%	0.4%	0.89	42.3	26,603,774	42.3	26,603,774
Denmark	420.0	50,158,332	7.9%	420.0	49,287,832	0.0%	-1.7%	370.00	43,529,412	-11.9%	-11.7%	8.17				
Finland	73.0	11,455,934	1.8%	78.0	11,197,125	6.8%	-2.3%	13.12	11,478,565	8.9%	2.5%	2.22	13.5	11,811,024	14.0	12,248,469
France	100.0	14,742,084	2.3%	105.0	14,197,165	5.0%	-3.7%	16.00	13,998,250	0.0%	-1.4%	0.24				
Germany	42.5	20,052,452	3.2%	47.0	21,529,525	10.6%	7.4%	25.05	21,918,635	4.3%	1.8%	0.27				
Greece	140	385,849	0.1%					0.29 e/	256,754			0.02	0.3	256,754		
Ireland	3.4	4,141,291	0.7%	4.85	5,660,135	42.6%	36.7%	8.88 e/	7,769,904	44.2%	37.3%	2.07	12.7	11,106,820		
Italy	26,000.0	12,410,264	2.0%	35,000.0	15,581,269	34.6%	25.6%	17.20	15,048,119	0.0%	-3.4%	0.26				
Japan		100,000,000	15.8%		96,000,000		-4.0%		86,770,000 f/			0.69				
Luxembourg	30.0	696,330	0.1%	33.0	700,985	10.0%	0.7%	0.90	787,273	10.0%	12.3%	1.82				
Netherlands	160.0	65,919,555	10.4%	165.0	66,275,938	3.1%	0.5%	74.87	65,506,330	0.0%	-1.2%	4.14				
New Zealand	4.4	2,072,899	0.3%	6.0	2,820,087	36.4%	26.4%	6.28	2,730,435	4.7%	4.2%	0.72				
Norway	560	65,811,210	10.4%	620.0	68,817,331	10.7%	4.6%	645.00	73,212,259	4.0%	6.4%	16.42				
Portugal		800,000	0.1%		1,600,000		10.0%		1,600,000 *	0.0%	0.0%	0.16				
Spain	360.00	1,980,818	0.3%	1,801.0	9,776,575	-0.1%		6.01 *	5,258,199	0.0%	-1.7%	0.13				
Sweden	530	58,474,280	9.2%	530.0	53,084,936	0.0%	-9.2%	530.00	50,610,784	0.0%	-4.7%	5.71	530.0	51,456,311	530.0	51,456,311
Switzerland	52.0	31,515,152	5.0%	52.0	29,213,483	0.0%	-7.3%	52.00	31,137,725	0.0%	6.6%	4.36	53.0	31,736,527	54.0	32,335,329
United Kingdom	35.0	53,140,097	8.4%	37.0 *	52,908,757	5.7%	-0.4%	37.00	52,857,143	5.7%	-0.1%	0.89				
United States		71,895,791	11.3%		79,241,315		8.9%		97,100,000	11.5%	11.5%	0.35				
Subtotal DAC		**615,029,883**	**97.0%**		**633,348,536**		**3.0%**		**625,988,433**							
Others		**19,106,136**	**3.0%**		**18,400,873**		**-3.7%**		**32,000,000**							
TOTAL UNDP		**634,135,819**	**100.0%**		**651,780,409**		**2.8%**		**657,988,433**		**1.0%**					

1.b. Non-DAC																
Andorra		21,600			11,750											
Cyprus																
Holy See																
Iceland		210,345														
Israel																
Liechtenstein	15,000	9,146		15,000	8,427											
Malta		400														
Monaco		10,000			10,000				10,000							
Subtotal non-DAC		251,491			30,177											

NOTE: With the introduction of the Euro, States members have communicated their pledges in this currency, except for one, which communicated its pledge in both Euro and legacy currency".

* Based on the Secretariat's best estimates. Written commitments were not available before the finalization of this table

a/ Preliminary

b/ 2002 percentage change refers to change in initial pledged amounts over 2001.

c/ Using the 2000 World Bank population data

d/ Includes the equivalent in euros of ATS28.7 million from prior year's pledge.

e/ These figures represents the Euro equivalent of Greece and Ireland pledges of Drachmas and Pounds respectively.

f/ Represents an increase of 3.2% in yen terms over 2001 pledge

DRM/BRSP
April 2002

1.c. Programme countries by region	2000 Income received			2001Income received (preliminary)			2002 pledges received as of April 2002		2003 pledges received as of April 2002		2004 pledges received as of April 2002	
	Total income $	Net core contribution $	GLOC payments $	Total income $	Net Core contribution $	GLOC payments $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $
Africa												
Angola	372,528	0	372,528	840,489	5,000	835,489	3,000					
Benin	669,077	357,260	311,817	138,955		138,955						
Botswana	0	0	0	770,939	7,169	763,770						
Burkina Faso	44,460	(1)	44,461	0								
Burundi	6,885	0	6,885	5,981		5,981						
Cameroon	0	0	0	286,366		286,366						
Cape Verde	0	0	0	0								
Central African Republic	0	0	0	0								
Chad	0	0	0	111,787		111,787						
Comoros	31,483	0	31,483	0								
Congo	0	0	0	226,981		226,981						
Côte d'Ivoire	0	0	0	68,102		68,102						
Equatorial Guinea	282,869	0	282,869	277,211	11,019	266,192						
Ethiopia	152,736	0	152,736	155,509		155,509						
Gabon	0	0	0	0								
Gambia	0	0	0	0			6,000					
Ghana	0	0	0	0			60,000					
Guinea	0	0	0	17,355		17,355						
Kenya	0	0		0								
Lesotho	75,712	(37,092)	112,804	70,890	70,890							
Liberia	47	47	0	0								
Madagascar	47,743	0	47,743	136,137	1,382	134,755						
Malawi	331,291	0	331,291	0								
Mali	0	0	0	0								
Mauritania	0	0	0	70,367		70,367						
Mauritius	86,781	0	86,781	86,195	6,916	79,279						
Mozambique	1,000	0	1,000	0								
Namibia	70,721	0	70,721	125,471		125,471						
Niger				20,254		20,254						
Nigeria	0	0	0	0			20,000		20,000			
Rwanda	0	0	0	0								
Sao Tome and Principe	29,936	0	29,936	27,155		27,155						
Senegal	0	0	0	323,938		323,938						
Seychelles	0	0	0	64,625		64,625						
Sierra Leone	0	0	0	0								
South Africa	144,377	0	144,377	536,124		536,124						
Swaziland	201,501	8,035	193,466	303,005		303,005						
Togo	28,549	0	28,549	0								
Uganda	7,524	0	7,524	338,943	2,000	336,943						
United Republic of Tanzania	22,659	0	22,659	118,778	5,656	113,122						
Zaire (Democratic Rep. Of Congo)	0	0	0	0								
Zambia	56,338	0	56,338	7,114		7,114						
Zimbabwe	321,344	0	321,344	185,871		185,871						
Subtotal	2,985,581	328,249	2,657,312	5,294,530	110,031	5,184,508	86,000	0	20,000	0		
Asia and the Pacific												
Bangladesh	20,427	0	20,427	400,000	144,600	255,400	400,000	19,147				
Bhutan	63,730	11,232	52,498	69,357	8,857	60,500	13,600					
Brunei Darussalam	0	0	0	0								
Cambodia	100,000	0	100,000	120,000		120,000						
China	3,101,109	2,654,191	446,918	3,251,357	2,997,557	253,800	3,100,000	302,444				

Table 1(a) (continued)

1.c. Programme countries by region	2000 Income received			2001Income received (preliminary)			2002 pledges received as of April 2002		2003 pledges received as of April 2002		2004 pledges received as of April 2002	
	Total income $	Net core contribution $	GLOC payments $	Total income $	Net Core contribution $	GLOC payments $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $
Cook Islands	72,778	0	72,778	11,282		11,282						
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	37,537	0	37,537	46,511		46,511		37,209				
Fiji	0	0	0	107,365		107,365						
Hong Kong, China	0	0	0	0								
India	4,625,095	4,386,823	238,272	4,518,918	4,411,118	107,800	4,500,000					
Indonesia	0	0	0	243,228		243,228						
Iran, Islamic Republic of	14,682	0	14,682	56,512		56,512						
Kiribati	0	0	0	0								
Lao People's Democratic Republic	119,926	0	119,926	94,435		94,435						
Malaysia	411,497	109,197	302,300	79,576		79,576	385,000					
Maldives	144,019	7,500	136,519	203,288	7,500	195,788	7,500					
Marshall Islands	0	0	0	0								
Micronesia (Federated States of)	29,686	3,086	26,800	0								
Mongolia	255,926	34,000	221,926	112,524	4,024	108,500	17,000					
Myanmar	10,467	0	10,467	3,334		3,334	2,400					
Nepal	137,703	0	137,703	228,861	80,000	148,861						
Niue	22,831	0	22,831	20,304		20,304						
Pakistan	736,437	468,137	268,300	683,742	417,042	266,700	450,789					
Palau	0	0	0	4,660		4,660						
Papua New Guinea	305,582	0	305,582	130,687		130,687						
Philippines	384,631	0	384,631	323,360		323,360						
Republic of Korea	2,361,290	1,893,290	468,000	2,191,014	1,975,214	215,800	2,000,000		2,000,000			
Samoa	158,592	6,000	152,592	86,312		86,312						
Singapore	300,000	300,000	0	300,000	300,000		300,000					
Solomon Islands	0	0	0	0								
Sri Lanka	2,069,280	2,025,480	43,800	1,000,000	971,300	28,700						
Thailand	1,273,457	348,557	924,900	1,321,742	438,242	883,500	865,112	358,000				
Tokelau	0	0	0	15,097		15,097						
Tonga	30,000	4,700	25,300	0								
Tuvalu	35,440	14,828	20,612	(2,993)		(2,993)						
Vanuatu	0	0	0	0								
Viet Nam	242,333	0	242,333	225,430	58,070	167,360						
Subtotal	**17,084,765**	**12,267,021**	**4,817,854**	**15,845,904**	**11,813,525**	**4,032,379**	**12,041,401**	**718,800**	**2,000,000**	**0**		
Arab States												
Algeria	100,000	0	100,000	100,000		100,000	100,000					
Bahrain	1,143,679	112,000	1,031,679	748,957	58,000	690,957						
Djibouti	0	0	0	0			1,000					
Egypt	623,294	386,083	237,211	339,979	0	339,979	67,049					
Iraq	0	0	0	0								
Jordan	509,887	223,787	286,100	509,887	231,887	278,000	269,774					
Kuwait	0	0	0	1,140,000	1,085,200	54,800						
Lebanon	500,000	0	500,000	500,000		500,000						
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	218,242	0	218,242	783,319		783,319						
Morocco	450,118	67,718	382,400	1,047,451	185,416	862,036	151,778					
Oman	0	0		0								
Qatar	77,602	0	77,602	0								
Saudi Arabia	2,000,000	2,000,000	0	3,600,000	2,000,000	1,600,000	2,000,000					
Syrian Arab Republic	187,084	0	187,084	311,637	21,507	290,130						
Tunisia	283,426	39,226	244,200	289,474	83,475	205,999	178,472					
United Arab Emirates	648,000	648,000	0	1,319,612	324,000	995,612	324,000					

Table II.c (continued)

I.c. Programme countries by region	2000 Income received			2001 Income received (preliminary)			2002 pledges received as of April 2002		2003 pledges received as of April 2002		2004 pledges received as of April 2002	
	Total income $	Net core contribution $	GLOC payments $	Total income $	Net Core contribution $	GLOC payments $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $
Yemen	202,338	40,000	162,338	173,503		173,503						
SUBTOTAL	**6,943,870**	**3,518,814**	**3,426,856**	**10,841,819**	**3,987,484**	**6,854,335**	**3,112,073**	**0**	**0**	**0**		
Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States												
Albania	0	0	0	199,745		199,745						
Armenia	0	0	0	0								
Azerbaijan	42,900	0	42,900	0								
Belarus	96,672	0	96,672	126,547		126,547						
Bulgaria	125,810	0	125,810	125,198	24,000	101,198						
Czech Republic	395,831	388,731	29,100	354,967	217,769	137,198	308,989	42,135	337,079	42,135		
Estonia	70,039	0	70,039	30,575		30,575						
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	5,000	0	5,000	0								
Hungary	0	0	0	0								
Kazakhstan	120,000	0	120,000	120,000		120,000						
Kyrgyzstan	5,309	0	5,309	0								
Latvia	206,889	5,000	201,889	131,458		131,458						
Lithuania	55,500	0	55,500	103,063		103,063						
Poland	670,496	314,796	285,700	857,757	527,457	330,300						
Republic of Moldova	29,799	0	29,799	30,377		30,377						
Romania	99,033	18,883	80,170	100,721		100,721						
Russian Federation	525,453	0	525,453	450,000		450,000	450,000		450,000			
Slovakia	0	0	0	10,000		10,000		261,000		261,000		
Slovenia	2,500	2,500	0	43,350	3,250	40,100						
Turkey	1,766,174	883,674	902,500	0								
Turkmenistan	5,200	5,200	0	0								
Ukraine	87,947	0	87,947	50,098		50,098						
Yugoslavia	0	0	0	0								
SUBTOTAL	**4,267,432**	**1,630,784**	**2,673,569**	**2,733,857**	**772,476**	**1,961,381**	**758,989**	**303,135**	**787,079**	**303,135**		
Latin America and the Caribbean												
Anguilla	32,350	0	32,350	0								
Antigua and Barbuda	24,265	0	24,265	24,265		24,265						
Argentina	0	0	0	0								
Aruba	0	0	0	0								
Bahamas	0	0	0	0								
Barbados	178,710	0	178,710	193,241		193,241						
Belize	25,253	0	25,253	50,505		50,505						
Bolivia	140,000	0	140,000	291,323		291,323						
Brazil	0	0	0	0								
British Virgin Islands	34,856	16,632	18,224	30,164	8,316	21,848						
Cayman Islands	12,700	0	12,700	0								
Chile	2,244	0	2,244	(150,000)	(534,800)	384,800						
Colombia	517,514	41,414	476,100	794,744	388,800	405,944	350,000	200,000				
Costa Rica	351,879	1,978	349,701	405,508	46,508	359,000						
Cuba	1,552,754	1,352,754	200,000	1,552,754	1,352,754	200,000						
Dominica	23,000	0	23,000	0								
Dominican Republic	14,000	0	14,000	5,000	5,000							
Ecuador	480,812	0	480,812	0								
El Salvador	430,960	0	430,960	430,960		430,960						
Grenada	125,079	0	125,079	0								
Guatemala	0	0	0	350,420		350,420						

Table 1(a) (continued)

1.c. Programme countries by region	2001 income received			2001 income received (preliminary)			2002 pledges received as of April 2002		2003 pledges received as of April 2002		2004 pledges received as of April 2002	
	Total income $	Net core contribution $	GLOC payments $	Total income $	Net Core contribution $	GLOC payments $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $	Core Pledges $	GLOC pledges $
Guyana	43,330	0	43,330	50,802	21,390	29,412						
Haiti	0	0	0	0								
Honduras	113,844	0	113,844	54,014		54,014						
Jamaica	33,190	0	33,190	0								
Mexico	1,002,895	171,494	831,401	1,003,419	128,319	875,100						
Montserrat	23,220	0	23,220	0								
Netherlands Antilles	0	0	0	0								
Nicaragua	487,490	0	487,490	382,750		382,750						
Panama	(49,826)	(491,738)	441,912	617,882	240,882	376,970						
Paraguay	63,826	0	63,826	24,906		24,906						
Peru	0	0	0	900,000		900,000						
Saint Kitts and Nevis	94,800	0	94,800	0								
Saint Lucia	0	0	0	52,250		52,250						
Saint Vincent & the Grenadines	28,137	0	28,137	90,000	30,000	30,000						
Suriname	0	0	0	0								
Trinidad and Tobago	1,613	0	1,613	0								
Turks and Caicos	43,070	0	43,070	0								
Uruguay	50,000	0	50,000	0								
Venezuela	534,061	13,261	520,800	0								
Subtotal	6,415,726	1,108,795	5,306,931	7,104,887	1,687,178	5,417,708	350,000	250,000	0	0		
Other			16,850	0								
Total all regions	37,897,548	18,854,643	18,904,901	41,821,809	18,370,899	23,450,910	18,348,483	1,218,933	2,807,070	393,136		

DRM/BRSP
April 2002

Table 1 (b). Commitments to UNCDF regular resources, 2002-2004 and income received, 2000-2001
in local currency and US dollars, based on UN exchange rates as of 1 April 2002

OECD/DAC members	2000 income received			2001 income received				2002 pledges			2003 pledges		2004 pledges	
	Local currency	$	Share of total core contribution	Local currency	$	change in local currency	change in US dollar	Local currency	$	change in $	Local currency	$		
Austria														
Belgium	1 250 000	619 589	1.7%	20 000 000	450 116		1.7%	619 734	542 196	-22.2%	619 734	542 196		
Canada			2.2%	125 000	80 875			125 000	79 815	-2.5%				
Denmark	35 000 000	5 054 299	27.8%	51 000 000	5 442 298	3.7%	3.7%	30 000 000	3 529 411	-45.7%				
Finland		713 140	3.5%											
France (c)	8 000 000	1 180 240	4.5%	1 200 000	1 101 928		2.5%							
Italy	750 000	762 750	3.9%	750 000	256 577	62.7%	57.9%	145 000	173 295	-42.7%				
Japan		1 220 000	4.2%		1 000 000		2.2%		782 608	-21.9%				
Netherlands	15 000 000	6 250 181	23.1%	15 000 000	6 173 660	0.7%	1.1%	7 000 000	6 302 120	2.1%				
New Zealand	300 000	173 181	0.7%	300 000	152 836	2.0%	11.9%	500 000	211 961	42.7%				
Norway	29 000 000	3 486 525	14.5%	30 000 000	3 714 325	3.4%	6.5%	30 000 000	3 405 231	-2.7%				
Sweden	42 000 000	4 539 855	18.9%	50 000 000	4 795 400	19.0%	5.6%	50 000 000	4 854 369	1.4%	50 000 000	4 854 369	50 000 000	4 854 369
Switzerland			3.0%											
United States			0.0%		500 000									
Subtotal DAC		**23 017 225**	**59.6%**		**24 280 827**		**1.5%**		**19 033 089**					
Others														
Bangladesh		3 000	0.0%		3 000		0.0%		3 000	0.0%				
Bhutan		2 000	0.0%						3 000					
China		30 000	0.1%		30 000		0.0%							
Cuba			0.0%											
Liberia		1 038	0.0%											
Maldives		2 000	0.0%											
Mozambique		1 000	0.0%											
Myanmar		194	0.0%						5 000					
Republic of Korea		15 000	0.1%		15 000		0.0%		15 000	0.0%		15 000		
Senegal			0.0%											
Thailand		2 500	0.0%						2 500					
Tunisia								2 752	1 837					
Yemen			0.0%		3 543									
Subtotal others		**55 326**	**0.2%**		**52 543**		**-10.5%**		**31 297**					
TOTAL UNCDF		**23 072 551**	**100.0%**		**24 342 870**		**1.5%**		**19 064 865**					

Table 1(c). Continued

Donors	2000 income received			2001 income received (preliminary)				2002 pledges				2003 pledges		2004 pledges	
						change in				change in					
	Local currency (in millions)	$	share of total core contribution	Local currency (in millions)	$	local currency	$	Local currency (in millions)	$	local currency	$	Local currency (in millions)	$		
China		30,000	0.2%		30,000				30,000						
Cyprus		1,270	0.0%		2,400				2,400						
Czech Republic			0.0%	0.5	12,853			500,000.00	13,389			500,000	13,889		
Ghana			0.0%												
Guyana		1,923	0.0%												
Iceland	1.00		0.0%	1.00											
India	0.50	11,648	0.1%	0.50	11,022			509,000.00	10,604						
Indonesia			0.0%												
Lesotho		1,155	0.0%												
Liechtenstein		6,098	0.0%		5,814				5,814						
Malaysia		10,000	0.1%		5,000				5,000						
Maldives		1,700	0.0%		1,700				1,700						
Malta		1,000	0.0%												
Mauritius			0.0%												
Mexico		10,000	0.1%		10,000				10,000						
Morocco		2,000	0.0%						2,000						
Mozambique		1,000	0.0%												
Nepal					2,000				2,000						
Pakistan	0.13	2,181	0.0%	0.19											
Paraguay			0.0%												
Philippines			0.0%												
Poland			0.0%												
Republic of Korea		15,000	0.1%						14,200						
Samoa			0.0%												
Senegal			0.0%												
Singapore		40,000	0.2%		40,000				40,000						
South Africa	0.10	15,780	0.1%		12,524				12,524						
Thailand	0.12	9,570	0.1%		8,207			410,000.00	9,535						
Tunisia					3,310										
Turkey		15,000	0.1%						5,000						
NGOs			0.0%												
[illegible]					1,000										
[illegible]			0.0%												
[illegible]					2,665				2,665						
[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]				[illegible]						
[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]				[illegible]						

Table 1 (c). Commitments/estimates of contributions to UNIFEM regular resources : 2002-2004 and income received in 2000-2001 in local currency and US dollars, based on UN exchange rates as of 1 April 2002

Donors	2000 income received			2001 income received (preliminary)				2002 pledges/estimates				2003 pledges		2004 pledges	
						change in				change in					
	Local currency (in millions)	$	share of total core contribution	Local currency (in millions)	$	local currency	$	Local currency (in millions)	$	local currency	$	Local currency (in millions)	$		
OECD/DAC															
Australia	0.36	233,766	1.2%	0.37	202,186	2.8%	-13.5%	0.37	194,737	0.0%	-3.7%				
Austria		62,000	0.3%						58,000						
Belgium a/	0.50	363,743	1.9%												
Canada	1.25	844,595	4.4%	1.25	796,178	0.0%	-5.7%	1.25	786,164	0.0%	-1.3%	1.25	786,163.52		
Denmark	3.00	346,821	1.8%	5.00	598,802	66.7%	72.7%	5.00	588,235	0.0%	-1.8%				
Finland	2.00	472,438	2.5%	3.00	458,694	50.0%	-2.9%	0.51	447,368		-2.5%				
France	0.50	72,526	0.4%	0.50		0.0%	-100.0%								
Germany	1.60	752,796	3.9%	1.60	738,038	0.0%	-2.0%	0.82	717,410		-2.8%				
Greece		7,200	0.0%		4,000		-44.4%		4,000		0.0%				
Ireland	0.15	182,704	1.0%		445,674		143.9%	0.49	429,825		-3.6%				
Italy	5,000.00	2,935,011	15.4%	6,000.0	2,655,302	20.0%	-9.5%		2,374,628		-10.6%				
Japan		1,416,000	7.4%		1,416,000		0.0%		1,018,000		-28.1%				
Luxembourg	16.00	417,798	2.2%	20.0	424,839	25.0%	1.7%	0.59	517,544		21.8%				
Netherlands	7.40	3,073,699	16.1%	8.35	3,246,842	12.8%	5.6%	3.79	3,315,836		2.1%				
New Zealand	0.30	148,515	0.8%	0.4	174,672	33.3%	17.6%	0.40	173,913		-0.4%				
Norway	16.00	1,953,602	10.2%	18	2,022,472	12.5%	3.5%	18.00	2,043,133	0.0%	1.0%				
Portugal			0.0%												
Spain	7.50	105,786	0.6%	8	127,677	6.7%	20.7%	0.05	43,745		-65.7%				
Sweden	10.00	1,030,340	5.4%	14	1,310,652	40.0%	27.2%	14.00	1,333,333	0.0%	1.7%	14	1,359,223.30	14	1,359,223.30
Switzerland	0.80	484,848	2.5%	0.8	449,438	0.0%	-7.3%	0.80	479,042	0.0%	6.6%	0.9	538,922.16	0.9	538,922.16
United Kingdom	2.50	3,843,029	20.2%	2.5	3,561,951	0.0%	-7.3%	3.00	4,285,714	20.0%	20.3%				
United States		49,742	0.3%		1,898,000 b/		3715.7%		1,000,000		11.1%				
Subtotal DAC		**18,796,959**	**98.6%**		**20,531,417**		**9.2%**		**19,810,627**						
Others															
Andorra		20,500	0.1%		11,100				11,100						
Bangladesh			0.0%		1,000				1,000						
Barbados		1,000	0.0%		1,000				1,000						
Brazil		50,000	0.3%												
Burkina Faso		7,269	0.0%												
Cameroon		4,615	0.0%												
Chile		10,000	0.1%												

Table 1 (d). Commitments/estimates of contributions to UNV regular resources: 2002-2003 and income received, 2000-2001 in local currency and US dollars, based on UN exchange rates as of 1 April 2002

Donors	2000 income received			2001 income received (preliminary)				2002* pledges/estimates		2003 pledges/estimates		2004 pledges/estimates	
	Local currency	$	share of total core contribution	Local currency	$	change in local currency	change in US dollar	Local currency	$	Local currency	$		
DECD/DAC													
Austria**		50.000	1.71%					115.000	102.000	58.000	51.000		
Belgium								170.000	180.000	280.000	280.000		
Canada	100.000	64.513	2.21%	100.000	65.526	0.00%	1.57%	100.000	62.893	100.000	62.893		
France	900.000	71.628	2.46%	80.000	66.572		-7.31%	120.000	104.987	120.000	104.987		
Germany	3.500.000	1.844.498	98.32%	3.500.000	1.810.177	0.00%	-2.09%	1.790.000	1.998.054	1.790.000	1.998.054		
Ireland	150.000	152.611	8.25%	800.000	683.980	300.00%	274.56%	785.000	675.500	785.000	675.500		
Italy					131.317			200.000	176.800	200.000	176.800		
Netherlands	750.000	314.202	10.78%	750.000	299.529	0.00%	-4.67%						
Sweden			0.00%	3.000.000	294.389			3.000.000	291.282	3.000.000	291.282		
Switzerland	900.000	547.108	11.88%	600.000	332.668	20.00%	-4.16%	600.000	359.281	600.000	359.281		
United States		100.000	3.42%		100.000				100.000		100.000		
Subtotal DAC		**2,774,789**	**96.83%**		**3,584,179**				**3,586,679**		**3,637,679**		
Others													
Bangladesh		1.000	0.03%		1.000				1.000		1.000		
Bhutan		1.404	0.05%						1.700		1.700		
Burkina Faso		3.615	0.12%										
China		30.000	1.03%		30.000				30.000		30.000		
Cyprus		2.540	0.09%		2.400				2.500		2.500		
Czech Republic	1.250.000	30.972	1.08%	1.250.000	31.738			1.250.000	35.112	1.250.000	35.112		
India		15.000	0.51%		15.000				15.000		15.000		
Lesotho		1.335	0.05%										
Panama					500				500		500		
Sri Lanka		3.000	0.10%						3.000		3.000		
Syrian Arab Republic		1.425	0.05%		1.425				1.500		1.500		
Thailand***		4.911							2.270		2.270		
Turkey		50.000	1.71%						50.000		50.000		
Other					89.206				50.000		50.000		
Subtotal		143.202	4.97%		151.269				192.582				
TOTAL		2,918,991	100.0%		3,735,447				3,730,160		3,730,160		

* At the time of preparation of the document, a number of donors were still in the process of determining the level of their contributions to the SVF. Thus the contribution for 2002 is expected to be more than the amount stated.

** Contribution of $51,000 received from Austria in 2002 for 2001.

*** Contribution of $2,270 received from Thailand in 2000 for 2001.

Table 2. Schedule of payments to UNDP regular resources, 2002

DAC donors	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Australia												
Austria						x						
Belgium	x											
Canada				x								x
Denmark						x						
Finland												
France			x									
Germany												
Greece												
Ireland		x										
Italy				x								
Japan												
Luxembourg												
Netherlands	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
New Zealand		x										
Norway	x			x			x			x		
Portugal												
Spain												
Sweden *	x						x					
Switzerland				x								
United Kingdom												
United States												

* Partial payment was received in December 2001

Table 3. Government in-kind contribution
(thousand of US dollars)

Region/Country Office	2000	2001
AFRICA		
Benin	27.25	28.69
Burkina Faso	52.70	54.20
Burundi	65.21	68.67
Central African Republic	55.64	81.90
Comoros	20.90	22.01
Congo	107.64	113.34
Côte d'Ivoire	99.53	104.81
Equatorial Guinea	19.97	21.03
Gambia	22.50	21.80
Ghana	201.14	211.80
Lesotho	81.43	85.75
Malawi	36.50	38.43
Mozambique	42.43	44.68
Niger	45.24	47.64
Nigeria	99.63	104.91
Rwanda	90.48	95.28
Sierre Leone	61.98	65.26
South Africa	124.80	131.41
Togo	139.98	147.40
United Republic of Tanzania	220.00	246.40
Total Africa region	**1,614.95**	**1,735.41**
ARAB STATES		
Algeria	67.18	70.74
Bahrain	73.22	77.10
Kuwait	57.10	60.13
Lebanon	694.50	731.31
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	155.06	163.28
Qatar	72.70	76.55
Saudi Arabia	167.23	176.09
Sudan	48.26	262.40
Tunisia	83.62	88.05
United Arab Emirates	117.10	123.31
Total Arab States region	**1,535.97**	**1,828.96**
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC		
Bhutan	12.30	12.95
India	354.12	372.89
Indonesia	69.99	73.70
Lao People's Democratic Republic	33.28	35.04
Malaysia	143.73	151.35
Philippines	269.15	88.40
Republic of Korea	47.70	0.00
Sri Lanka	120.12	126.49
Viet Nam	107.54	113.24
Total Asia and the Pacific region	**1,157.93**	**974.06**

Table 3. Government in-kind contribution
(thousand of US dollars)

Region/Country Office	2000	2001
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN		
Barbados	187.20	215.20
Chile	318.86	335.76
Cuba	87.88	92.54
Dominican Republic	245.44	258.45
Guyana	75.50	79.50
Jamaica	58.24	61.33
Panama	41.60	43.80
Paraguay	48.36	50.92
Trinidad and Tobago	98.79	87.50
Uruguay		48.19
Total Latin America and the Caribbean region	**1,161.87**	**1,273.19**
EUROPE AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES		
Albania	76.75	80.82
Armenia	183.14	192.85
Azerbaijan	57.20	60.23
Belarus	204.46	215.30
Bulgaria	144.00	158.40
Croatia	55.54	58.48
Estonia	19.24	20.26
Georgia	336.50	354.33
Kazakhstan	446.00	469.64
Kyrgyzstan	78.62	82.79
Latvia	336.02	353.83
Lithuania	46.90	49.39
Macedonia	71.00	74.76
Poland	102.65	108.09
Republic of Moldova	187.93	197.89
Romania	133.00	140.05
Slovak Republic	260.62	274.44
Tajikistan	74.88	78.85
Turkmenistan	381.40	233.20
Ukraine	360.67	379.79
Uzbekistan	335.70	353.49
Total Europe and CIS region	**3,892.22**	**3,936.88**
GRAND TOTAL	**9,362.94**	**9,748.50**

United Nations DP/2002/17

Executive Board of the
United Nations Development
Programme and of the
United Nations Population Fund

Distr.: General
4 June 2002

Original: English

Annual Session 2002
17-28 June 2002, Geneva
Item 12 of the provisional agenda
Programme financing

Issues and principles for possible improvements in the present programming arrangements*

Summary

In its decision 99/2, the Executive Board requested that the Administrator submit a report to the Board at its annual session 2002 on possible improvements in the distribution model for resources under the target for resource assignment from the core (TRAC), including a review of thresholds.

The Executive Board will also have to confirm or modify the overall financial framework for the allocation of regular programme resources for 2004 and beyond, since the current programming arrangements were endorsed for the period ending 31 December 2003.

As part of the preparatory process for the review, UNDP presented a working paper (DP/2002/WP.1) in early January 2002 that identified a number of possible changes in both the distribution model for TRAC resources and with regard to other aspects of the existing arrangements. Informal consultations were arranged between January and May 2002 to review these proposals. At these informal sessions a number of technical notes were also presented.

To facilitate timely decisions by the Executive Board on the programming arrangements for 2004 and beyond, the present paper provides a summary of the recommended options for change in the current programming arrangements as identified during or as a result of these informal consultations.

* The collection and analysis of current data required to present the Executive Board with the most up-to-date information has delayed submission of the present document.

02-41458 (E) 100602

Introduction

1. The current paper provides a brief outline of the recommended options for change, as identified during the internal review of present arrangements by UNDP and the subsequent informal consultations with the Executive Board They are presented in three separate sections, as follows:

(a) Overall principles and financial parameters;

(b) Possible changes in the TRAC distribution model;

(c) Possible changes in the programming arrangements for specific programme lines other than TRAC line 1.1.1.

Current principles and overall financial parameters and features

2. Both the internal review carried out by UNDP and the subsequent informal consultations appear to confirm th continuing validity and usefulness of the overall parameters and features of the existing regular programming arrangements of UNDP.

3. The Administrator, however, proposes that the Executive Board consider a move from a three-year regular resources programming framework (2004-2006) to a four-year framework (2004-2007) so that it coincides with the pe of the multi-year funding framework (MYFF).

4. The earlier established provisional resource earmarkings for the eight regular resource programme lines (2001-2003) are reflected in column 1 of table 1. They are shown as a percentage of regular resources available for programming, i.e., after deduction of the biennial support budget that is approved separately by the Executive Board.

Possible changes in the TRAC 1 distribution model

5. In document DP/2002/WP.1, the Administrator, in response to decision 99/2, identified five specific areas fo possible changes in the current TRAC 1 distribution model:

(a) Changes in the net contributor country (NCC) threshold;

(b) Introducing some degree of flexibility in the share of total TRAC resources going to low and middle-income countries, respectively;

(c) Introducing a ceiling for individual TRAC resource earmarkings;

(d) Introducing minimum TRAC 1 earmarkings;

(e) Introducing additional or alternative TRAC 1 distribution criteria.

6. In light of the informal consultations, the Administrator proposes no change in the NCC threshold and to postpone any decision on the establishment of a ceiling for individual TRAC resource earmarkings until a later date v preliminary TRAC 1 earmarkings will be presented to the Executive Board on the basis of gross national income (GN per capita data for 2001. In this respect, it is noted that the number of NCCs is likely to increase if the current thresh maintained as a result of inflationary factors and the gradual upward movement of GNI per capita in middle-income countries due to economic growth. If the Board agrees to move to a four-year financial framework, it is proposed tha current three-year "grace" period for first time NCCs is also extended to four years.

7. The introduction of a ceiling on TRAC 1 earmarkings, though desirable in view of resource constraints, seems also to have no strong support at this juncture. The introduction of a ceiling would likely affect only a few countries that currently receive a floor supplement. Such floor supplements were earlier introduced by the Board (or Governing Council at that time) to ensure that a country's TRAC (or IPF at that time) would not see a drastic reduction in UNDP assistance from one programming period to the next due to relative changes in its GNI per capita in relation to that of other countries. This implies that, all other things being equal, the earmarkings of the concerned countries are likely to be gradually reduced over time as countries see their floors reduced by a certain percentage each subsequent programming period.

8. Similarly, following the internal review and informal consultations, the Administrator recommends no changes in the use of existing distribution criteria at this juncture, because the disadvantages resulting from the introduction of any of the various new indicators reviewed appear to outweigh the advantages. The Administrator, however, also recommends that the matter be kept under active review so that the use of other, or additional, criteria can be revisited again when issues of data availability, data reliability, methodological consistence and the underlying concepts have been resolved and/or clarified.

9. Based on the informal consultations, the Administrator proposes combining the introduction of a certain degree of flexibility in the share of total TRAC resources going to low-income countries with the introduction of minimum TRAC 1 earmarkings in such way that, at current resource levels, the share of TRAC 1 resources going to the low-income country group remains more or less the same as that for the current programming period. The proposed modifications in the current TRAC 1 distribution model can be summarized as follows:

(a) Distribution of available TRAC 1 resources in accordance with the current distribution formula under a "one-pool" model, i.e., without any predetermined share for low-income or middle-income countries. The application of the existing distribution formula without any predetermined fixed share for middle-income countries would strongly favour low-income countries. Using 2000 GNI per capita data, 92 per cent of TRAC resources would go to low-income countries;

(b) A minimum TRAC 1 allocation of $350 000 for all 117 non-NCC countries with a country office to be introduced within the TRAC 1 distribution model as an absolute floor. Separate minimum TRAC 1 allocations would also be established for the eight multi-country offices, with the minimum established at commensurate levels depending on the countries covered by the country office and their TRAC 1 earmarkings [in line with the approach used by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)]. The introduction of an absolute floor would still favour low-income countries, but less than the existing distribution formula.

10. If 2000 GNI per capita data are applied, the above arrangement would result in a share of TRAC 1 resources for low-income countries between 88 and 91 per cent under various resource scenarios ranging from $700 million to $1.1 billion. The higher the resource level, the greater would be the share for low-income countries.

11. The use of 2001 GNI data may cause some further shifts in the distribution of TRAC 1 resources. The Administrator, therefore, proposes that the Executive Board agree on a range, for example, from 85 to 91 per cent of total TRAC 1 resources for low-income countries, i.e., a spread of 3 per cent on each side of the current predetermined fixed share of 88 per cent. If the TRAC 1 calculations, in accordance with the distribution methodology set out above, result in a TRAC 1 percentage share for low-income countries outside the range, the Administrator will revert back to the Board for further adjustments. Additional adjustments, if required on the basis of 2001 GNI per capita data, could then be made by either adjusting the amount of the minimum TRAC 1 earmarking or by revising the GNI per capita thresholds at which the GNI per capita weights shift progressively.

12. The percentage range of 85 to 91 per cent would apply to both the calculation of TRAC 1 earmarkings and to the assignment of total TRAC 1 and 2 resources. Hence, the proposed arrangement would also provide the Administrator with greater flexibility when allocating TRAC 2 resources.

13. Similar to the UNICEF approach, the agreed minimum TRAC 1 earmarking would be reduced proportionately if the total regular resources available for programming would fall below a certain level (for example, $450 million, which would imply total regular resources of $700 million). The minimum TRAC 1 earmarking to be established for multi-country offices would constitute the minimum TRAC 1 earmarking for the countries covered by the concerned country office. Their individual share in the minimum TRAC 1 would be in proportion to their calculated TRAC 1 earmarkings.

14. As part of the above arrangements, the Executive Board may also wish to consider: (a) an arrangement for a mid-term (2005) recalculation of the TRAC 1 earmarkings on the basis of the latest available GNI per capita data available from the World Bank (2004 data for most countries); and (b) a special arrangement to recalculate, at any time, the TRAC 1 earmarkings for countries that have seen a significant drop in their World Bank GNI per capita figure from the 2001 figure used in the original calculation (for example, a reduction of more than 25 per cent combined with a drop below one of the thresholds used for low-income countries or NCC status).

Possible changes in the programming arrangements for specific programme lines

15. For reasons explained in document DP/2002/WP.1, in 2001 the Administrator initiated a review of the current arrangement for support for policy and programme development/support for technical services (SPPD/STS), which are financed under line 2.2 of the current financial framework for regular resources.

16. The main purpose of the review was to agree with the participating United Nations organizations on a number of modifications in order to simplify the facility's operational and procedural aspects and to strengthen its focus on new emerging priorities where strategic advisory services provided by the United Nations system can have the greatest impact.

17. Following consultations with United Nations organization partners during a series of inter-agency consultative meetings, including the recent one held in Geneva in April convened to discuss specific changes, the Administrator is pleased to inform the Executive Board that agreement has been reached in principle on all issues concerned.

18. Revised guidelines for the use of the facility, which is proposed to be renamed United Nations Strategic Advisory Facility (UNSAF), are under preparation and should be available for review by the Executive Board before the end of 2002. These new guidelines will clearly outline the underlying operational principles of the facility, its increased focus and drastically simplified procedures. It will also emphasize the United Nations system partnership dimension of the facility, both in terms of joint inter-agency activities and cooperation with entities outside the United Nations system.

19. With regard to the proposal to establish fixed absolute amounts for selected programme lines/programme components within the financial framework as outlined in paragraphs 30 through 32 of document DP/2002/WP.1, the Administrator recommends that the 2004 allocations for the concerned lines/components be set as detailed below.

20. For two of the components currently financed under line 1.3 global programme — the Human Development Report Office (HDRO) and the Office of Development Studies — and the Economist Programme, which was previously financed under the biennial budget, the fixed allocations, to become effective in 2004, would be set at $5.3 million, $1.1 million and $4.5 million, respectively, for reasons briefly explained below:

(a) The *Human Development Report (HDR)* (currently part of line 1.3) was launched in 1990 with the single goal of placing people at the centre of the development process in terms of the development debate, policy and advocacy. The current level of resources for the HDR stands at $5.3 million annually, of which about $2.9 million is financed from the global programme. In light of the significant role of the HDR in the overall development debate and the ongoing efforts to further strengthen HDRO support to the preparation of national human development reports, it is important for the programme to carryout its independent functions on a secured funding basis, thus avoiding the need to seek non-core resources. Many member states have frequently stated that the HDR should be adequately funded from regular resources.

(b) The *Office of Development Studies (ODS)* (currently part of line 1.3) contributes to the global development role of UNDP by providing forward-looking policy analyses and promoting research partnerships with leading think tanks around the world on issues of sustainable human development. It is also responsible for building bridges between policy analysis and policy-making. ODS publishes a number of thought-provoking books and discussion papers and organizes round tables, meetings and lecture series. These publications are invaluable to policy-makers, academics, development specialists and others interested in exploring key development issues. A reasonable level of $1.1 million is proposed under the fixed allocation, similar to the current level of $1 million and taking into consideration a modest inflation adjustment.

(c) The *Economist Programme* was reviewed within the context of the 2002-2003 support budget (DP/2001/21) when the Executive Board agreed to shift the economists programme, amounting to $4.0 million annually, from the support budget to the programme. This shift was to capture accurately the substantive character and value of the activities carried out by the economists at the country level. The proposed $4.5 million under the fixed allocation provides the level of resources required to maintain this important capacity at its current level, reflecting a modest inflation adjustment.

21. The total of $10.9 million would be shown as a separate line in the financial framework. The percentages for the regional and global programme earmarkings, line 1.2 and line 1.3 would be reduced accordingly by 0.5 and 0.8 per cent, respectively. The knowledge network would continue to be financed under the global and regional programme lines and could be considered for a move to the separate fixed programme line at a later date when it has been operational for some time. Doing so will make possible a more accurate assessment of its fixed funding needs.

22. For line 3.1, support to the resident coordinator and development support services (DSS), line 1.4, evaluation line and line 1.5, technical cooperation among developing countries, the following fixed allocations are proposed for reasons explained below:

(a) *Support to the resident coordinator (line 3.1).* A fixed annual allocation of $13.5 million for support to the resident coordinator reflects the recognition by the General Assembly of the role of UNDP as the funder and manager of the resident coordinator system. As such, UNDP is responsible for the coordination of United Nations system-wide operational activities at the country level. The current level of programme resources for this function has remained at around $4.6 million annually, with the result of country offices receiving on the average $35 000 annually. This amount is far from adequate for UNDP to respond effectively to the mandate of the General Assembly. The proposed level of $13.5 million under the fixed allocation will provide an average of $100 000 per country office, a reasonable level for programming for this crucial function.

(b) *Development support services (line 3.1).* A fixed annual allocation of $6 million is proposed because the current level of resources under this category of around $1million annually has proven to be inadequate. These resources provide resident representatives with flexibility in responding to emerging substantive needs of countries. Currently, when situations arise at the local level where UNDP can clearly play a role, resident representatives lack the reasonable level of resources to fund any quick-response interventions; other institutions such as the World Bank have this capacity. The average current amount available per country office is currently around $8 000. The proposed level of $6 million will provide an average of $45 000 per country office, a reasonable level for this support to resident representatives that would also help in leveraging non-core resources to support emerging needs in countries. It should also be noted that in the context of the 2002-2003 support budget (DP/2001/21), the Executive Board agreed to the UNDP proposal to utilize $2.5 million in budget savings annually to increase the DSS resource level.

(c) *Evaluation Office (line 1.4).* To carryout a systematic and comprehensive assessment of the results, effectiveness and impact of the substantive activities of the programme, a minimum level of resources is required. This need is underpinned by General Assembly resolution 56/201 (paragraphs 48-56) on the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development and the increased demand for independent validation of reported results, which subsequently warrants closer attention to the need for a stable resource base. Since 1999, the annual allocation to the Evaluation Office has declined from the originally envisaged level of $3 million to less than $1 million, which makes

the evaluation function vulnerable and difficult to sustain. For these reasons, a fixed allocation level of $2.5 million is proposed. The proposed amount should provide a reasonable level of programme resources to undertake monitoring and evaluation activities expected by the Executive Board and necessary to ensure the overall substantive accountability of the Administrator.

(d) *Technical cooperation among developing countries (line 1.5).* The current level of programme resources has remained at $1.7 million annually, which has been inadequate to support the mandated activities of this programme. TCDC is an integral part of country, regional and interregional programmes and a cost-effective modality for South-South technical cooperation. Having a reasonable level of resources will support the TCDC modality to foster the goals of national and collective self-reliance while broadening the scope and quality of international cooperation. It is on this basis that a fixed annual allocation of $3.5 million is proposed.

23. Any additional allocation to the above programme lines, if considered desirable by the Executive Board at a later date, should be accompanied by a commensurate reduction in the biennial budget. The proposed financial framework reflecting the proposed fixed allocations for each of the concerned lines/components, as detailed above, is shown in columns 2 and 3 of table 1.

24. This proposed framework also reflects a suggested regrouping of the existing lines to reflect better the specific nature of the concerned programme components. Hence, the UNSAF (old SPPD/STS) facility and the development support services shown under the country programme subheading as the concerned facilities are designed for programme activities at the country level. Similarly, line 1.5, on special resources for TCDC, line 1.4, on evaluation and the new line 1.6, on the HDRO/ODS/Economist Post are now grouped under the inter-country subheading. This grouping reflects better the nature of the concerned programmes. The TCDC facility is meant for South-South inter-country cooperation while the other two TRAC lines represent fixed programme costs related to the overall programme of UNDP.

25. With regards to the proposed special pool of TRAC 2 resources for opportunity-driven allocations as outlined in paragraphs 33 through 35 of document DP/2002/WP.1, the Administrator wishes to reiterate that the establishment of such a special pool would most likely only be feasible once the level of regular resources has passed the $900 million mark. In anticipation of a rise in regular resources, the Administrator would welcome the views on the proposal of the Executive Board. If agreement is reached on the desirability of such an arrangement, he can prepare more specific proposals regarding the specific operational and management principles that would govern the allocation of the concerned pool of resources.

Table 1 - Programme financial framework 2004-2007

UNDP Programme and support to operational activities of the United Nations [1]	Current percentage of resource available for programming at $1.1 billion	Fixed allocations (millions $)	Proposed percentage of resource available for programming at $1.1 billion
A. Programme			
Countries			
Lines 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 – TRAC	70.6%		70.9%
Line 1.1.3 – TRAC	6.6%		6.6%
Line 2.2 – UNSAF (SPPD/STS)	4.0%		4.0%
Line 3.1 – DSS	0.4%	6.0	0.7%
Subtotal	81.6%		82.2%
Inter-country			
Line 1.2 – Regional	10.0%		9.5%
Line 1.3 – Global	5.5%		4.7%
Line 1.4 – Evaluation	0.4%	2.5	0.3%
Line 1.5 – Special resources for TCDC	0.7%	3.5	0.4%
Line 1.6 – HDRO/ODS/Economists	0.0%	10.9	1.3%
Subtotal	16.6%		16.2%
Total programme	**98.2%**		**98.4%**
B. Support to operational activities of the United Nations			
Line 3.1 – Programme support to the resident coordinator	1.8%	13.5	1.6%
Total UNDP programmes and support to operational activities of the United Nations	**100.0%**	**36.4**	**100.0%**

[1] Lines are numbered in accordance with the currently approved financial framework. Numbering will be adjusted for next financial framework.